



Corres. and Mail  
**BOX AF**

AF/IFW

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2800

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named  
Inventor : Alexei V. Galatenko et al.

Appln. No.: 10/719,393

Filed : November 21, 2003

For : PROCESS AND APPARATUS FOR  
PLACEMENT OF MEGACELLS IN ICs  
DESIGN

Docket No.: 03-0937/L13.12-0257

Group Art Unit: 2825

Examiner: Nghia M.  
Doan

**RESPONSE AFTER FINAL**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING  
SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450,  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, THIS

4 DAY OF November, 2005

*Dann T. B-*

PATENT ATTORNEY

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 6, 2005 in which the rejections of claims 1-20 were made final.

The rejections are unsupported by the cited references and are based on a misreading of the references and/or a misapplication of the references to Applicants' claims.

In each case, the Office Action cites one or more paragraphs of the references as allegedly anticipating a claim element. Applicants have again carefully reviewed each citation and continue to find that these citations do not anticipate the element and are often entirely unrelated to the element.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, . . . , in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P.